

MINUTES
APRIL 11, 2005
CONSTRUCTION BOARD OF APPEALS
COMMUNITY CONFERENCE ROOM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ron Clark, John Glover and Ed Noonan

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bruce Bermel, Clinton Collins and Dave Fisher

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Kirchman, Chief Building Official
Bev Haw, Building Dept. Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT: Dan Everson, International Parts Supply; Dale Swanson, Dalsin Roofing

ROLL CALL

John Glover, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:05 a.m.

SUBJECT OF MEETING: Request for a variance by International Parts Supply. Reroof of commercial warehouse building located at 7220 Ohms Lane, Edina

Mr. Everson opened discussion by providing photos of the subject warehouse structure. The area in question is a 26,000 sq ft asphalt roof, built in 1977 with some cracks down the center. The building has been maintained regularly since it was purchased in 1991. Mr. Everson indicated that he and his brother intend on owning this building for approximately another 15 years. The warehouse portion of the building has had leaks over the past 3 – 4 years due to minimal snow coverage and severe cold causing a split. The splits have averaged about 12 ft in length and costing approximately \$15,000 over this time period. This year there was a split of approximately 20 ft directly over their inventory and this is what caused them to consider doing something different than a simple repair. The new roof turned out to be more expensive than they had originally thought but decided it was cost effective. The problem occurred when they applied for a permit and were told that there was a problem with the thermal barrier. Because they do not have a thermal barrier and they have a metal roof, in the event of a fire the polystyrene could melt through and cause a problem in the warehouse area. Mr. Everson informed the board that this is a sprinklered warehouse, maintained and checked regularly for proper operation. A repair of 25% or less would not require the thermal barrier. To meet the thermal barrier requirement would cost an additional \$40,000 on a \$99,000 job. This is a small company with about 10 employees and this would be a huge additional expense.

Discussion followed with regard to type of roofing, structural slope and warranty. It was determined that currently the warehoused items are primarily engine/transmission/drive automotive spares. Inventory is stored in “triwalls” which are bins stacked 4 high and it was discussed that they could be dropped down 1 row to allow the sprinkler system to work more effectively, property owner agreed to this modification. The ceiling height is about 18 ft.

The roof currently has a structural slope which would be maintained. Standard warranty on this roof would be 10 years with a longer warranty available. The rubber which would be used is 60 mil. Mr Kirchman explained that the purpose of the thermal barrier is to allow approximately an additional 15 minutes before the heat rises to a critical point where the plastic insulation starts flowing and dripping down through the seams of the roof onto warehoused product. Mr Everson feels that the existing sprinkler system currently provides that protection. Mr. Kirchman followed with discussion regarding sealing seams with icynene foam, however, this would probably not add any thermal qualities. Spray on fireproofing at those seams would certainly add thermal qualities however cost effectiveness is in question. There are currently no exceptions to thermal barrier requirements in the existing building code.

Ron Clark stated that he thought that the property owners request seemed to be cost effective and efficient and he would support the request to grant an exception to the code. Discussion followed regarding current storage issues/product and fire inspection issues. John Glover stated the value of the building would have to be discounted in 15 years if the roof required replacement and believes that the code directly addresses a life safety issue and the code does not take into consideration whether or not the building is sprinklered.

John Glover asked for further discussion, no response. Mr. Glover made a motion that the request be denied. Steve Kirchman stated that code does not address any appeal to the council, however, Mr Kirchman will consult with city attorney to verify any additional appeals process. Mr. Noonan suggested that additional research regarding sealing of the deck might be helpful. Mr. Kirchman discussed current codes and their effect on the fire sprinkler protection. Mr. Kirchman will check with the NFPA to see if they have any data on roofing codes and fire sprinkling. Mr. Kirchman indicated that he has some degree of comfort with Mr. Everson's suggestion that the fire sprinklers would provide the additional protection being discussed and this could be discussed further with the Fire Marshall. Mr Glover then withdrew his motion and suggested that this issue be continued for two weeks until the next meeting. This would allow for further discussion with the Fire Marshall and a vote in two weeks. Mr. Noonan suggested that the current storage items could change and that would change the danger factor. John Glover and Steve Kirchman will both contact Summit Fire and get their opinion on this situation. Mr. Kirchman will also contact the State of Minnesota for their interpretation of the Building Code. The City of Edina ordinance extends the authority of this board a little bit beyond that.

John Glover made a motion that this request be continued until the next meeting on April 25, 2005 to allow for further investigation. The motion was seconded by Ron Clark, voted and passed.

Discussion followed regarding the next meeting to be held on April 25, 2005 at 7:00 am. The subject of the next meeting is to discuss waiver of requirement for separate sewer and water connections to an existing twinhome. A third meeting will be scheduled for May 2, 2005 at 7:00 a.m. Some discussion followed.

ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned. 8:00 a.m.

